Hal Verb
P. O. Box 1815
San Francisco, CA 94101

December 1, 1983

Dear Hal:

I know it has been a long time since I've written you and kept in touch but I did want to mention a few things I came across recently that may be of interest to you. Before I begin to mention this I would like to know how you're doing & even though I realize that it would difficult - if not impossible - to keep abreast of what's happening at least this small attempt on my part will keep us in touch. Anyway, I do hope you're well and your wife also.

Paul Hoch sends me his news letter which I'm sure you also receive and that does give me some idea of what is going on. At least it is a non-media kind of information that I wouldn't find elsewhere. I have not kept up to date on the books, articles, etc. that have come out on the JFK & the MLK cases but the S.F. Chronicle did publish a review of a recent book by Jean Davison ("Oswald's Game") a copy of which I'm enclosing. The review is a dreadful re-hash of "the lone nut who wants to make history all by himself" theory that probably has been better written by other writers. I don't know who the reviewer is (his name is Larry Tool who once taught political history at Rutgers - my Alma Mater, incidentally) but if this is the kind of "history" he taught we're all in pretty bad shape. I'm tempted to call him up since he's in the area and find out why the Chronicle picked him as opposed to say, Paul Hoch who obviously has better credentials or even yourself...

but knowing the Chronicle's biased and consistent approach to the JFK case it is not surprising that the review (and the reviewer's biases) should appear.

Incidentally, over the KPFA radio recently I heard Jean Davison appear as a guest panelist airing her views. Peter Dale Scott was on the panel and I can't recall who else. When I was at a book store recently I glanced through her book (although many researchers are mentioned conspicuously absent was your name & particularly your book "Oswald in New Orleans"). Since she dwells quite a bit with Oswald's motivation before he commited the "final" act, New Orleans figures heavily in her work. It could be that she never read your work but if she had read it and ignored it, it is obvious to me, at least, why she would. The New Orleans episode leaves hardly any doubt that he (OSWALD) was establishing his credentials as a Marxist, pro-Cuban but was, in fact, doing this as a double agent for what I still believe were his intelligence connections. His WDSU "debate" and how the Commission & Bringuier handled it all point in one direction — a cover to hide his real purposes.

Well, I guess I should get her book & study it because I think it should be answered.

But I do want to get to the main reason I'm writing you and that is something I heard on the radio while I was driving in my car during the Thanksgiving vacation. I had been tuned to the JIM EASON show on KGO on Friday, Nov. 25th at about 2-5 p.m. The only reason I was tuned to him is that I never get a chance to hear him during the day since, obviously, I am working.

In any event, at about that time some woman called

and claimed that her father had driven the "other" Mustang car in the Martin Luther King assassination. She said that her father had killed Martin Luther King and not James Earl Ray. Not only did she say that her father had killed King but she also claimed that he was also responsible for the Atlanta children bombings. She did not identify herself but said that she had appeared on the "TODAY" show the "past summer" (which, I guess, means in 1983). Eason said he found it hard to believe her — after all, if she were going around saying her father had killed King why wouldn't he try to "eliminate" her? Her response to that was that he wouldn't dare to do that because other people whom she knew would come forth and in effect, reveal all. Besides, she said, she could see to it that he could be done away with if it ever came to that. Eason remained unconvinced by her story but the woman said she would offer evidence to him and then said "how much would it be worth to you?". Eason countered that he wasn't interested in paying for information and challenged her to present something substantive.

I didn't tape the show but made a few notes during the program. She did say that her father is in Henderson, North Carolina and that he is a "professional hit man" and a member of the "KLAN" (KKK). I presume "hit man" could mean a hit man for the "KLAN" and perhaps the "mob" but I can't be certain if she did state this latter point.

She had also mentioned that a woman witness in the King case "Grace Stevens" had information on the King case proving a conspiracy existed but that she had been put away in a "mental institution" and has been there for 10 years (presumably against her will.

Eason responded to this claim saying he knew of

Stevens & her being put away. He claimed he had contacted the institution and they told her that Steven was not being held against her will and was perfectly free to go anytime she wanted but that she had expressed no desire to leave (it wasn't clear to me if Eason had spoken with Stevens herself but it was my feeling that he had not & was therefore relying on an official there who said this).

The caller also mentioned that she had been in contact with a Danny Sheehan in Washington (probably D.C.) who had worked with her (or something) to do with ~~the~~ Greensboro (she didn't explain exactly what this meant). The caller pointed out that this was the first time she had called Eason's program (she said she waited patiently for "40 minutes" before going on). In fact, she stated, this was the first time she had heard his program. She mentioned she had actually tuned him in trying to listen to something else. (Ironically, it was the first time for me to be listening to him in ages!). If it wasn't for the fact that I had a day off, I would've never been listening.

Although she didn't mention how (or who) this Danny Sheehan (my spelling but this sounds like how she pronounced it) is, I did look his name up in the October 1982 Telephone Directory at the Library here and his name does appear as follows = DANIEL (& JUDITH) SHEEHAN
8603 TRUMPS HILL ROAD
WASHINGTON, D.C.
(UPPER MARLBORO) — (PHONE # 301-952-0552)

I thought perhaps he might be a lawyer but he is not listed in the yellow pages as an attorney & the listing I've given you is from the white pages. I believe you should call him to find out what he knows (I hope this is the same person she mentioned).

Soon after she got off (Eason made no attempt to get her name), another caller called & briefly

discussed the JFK assassination. He said he had recently been in Columbus, Ohio and had seen on TV an assassination film (not the Zapruder film) although he didn't say which film it was I'm pretty much convinced it was the Orville Nix film since he said it was viewing the assassination from "the other side". He claimed the film was very detailed & more close-up than anything he had ever seen before. He said the film was done in a "ROTO FILMOGRAPHIC" technique (his wording, not mine) & the film was provided for by a "local businessman" who was a local buff.

Do you have any idea as to whom he is referring to and what he means? I don't but I've been out of touch with buffs and I know a whole new generation of researchers have cropped up.

Well, I do hope the above will be of some value to you. But do keep in touch and I will try to let you know what I'm doing and, of course, if I can be of any help in any way, let me know.

By the way when Dave Lifton was in S.F. earlier this year he said he was working on a sequel to his book. Do you know anything about this. Last time I saw him was when he was in town and appeared on KGO radio. I tried to get an Oakland Tribune reporter to interview him but at the last minute that paper chickened out leaving the reporter totally mystified as to why. I said it was par for the course as you well know.

Anyway, keep well & do write.

Best,

Hal